

a report that they released recently entitled "ObamaCare: A Budget-Busting, Job-Killing Health Care Law." I have a copy of it here if anybody wants to get it. All you have to do is contact the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, we took up the challenge of reforming health care in this country because the system was broken and creating tremendous damage to the American economy. The fact is the health care law will help the economy. It will result in more efficiency, more stability of care, healthier Americans, and at fairer costs. That's what the law will do.

Republicans have repeatedly misused statistics from the CBO to support their argument that the law is primarily a "jobs killer." We are truly in a situation of Republican conclusions desperately in search of honest facts.

Let's look at the typical example—the Republicans' twisting of the views of experts to support their view. On the very first page of the report House Republicans released on January 6 entitled "ObamaCare," Republicans state that according to a nonpartisan CBO report from August 2010, the law will result in a loss of 650,000 jobs. Now you can get that from the CBO. It's available for people to read. But if you actually go to what they cite from the CBO report—it's on page 48—the report really says that the economy will use less labor because many people will choose to work less, or retire early, as a result of the benefits of the new law.

Let me read the exact quote from the Republican report. It says, "the nonpartisan CBO has determined that the law will reduce the amount of labor used in the economy by roughly half a percent," an estimate that adds up to roughly 650,000 jobs. The Republican report, however, deliberately chops off the last part of the CBO sentence to substantiate their claim. Here is the entire sentence: "The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the legislation, on net, will reduce the amount of labor used in the economy by a small amount—roughly half a percent—primarily by reducing the amount of labor that workers choose to supply." CBO explicitly makes clear that jobs will not be lost but instead that people will choose to work less in order to have a decent life. With the new health care law, the American people won't be drowning in health care costs and risks to their coverage.

Some evening, on Friday, fly home to Seattle with me and meet the flight attendants from United Airlines. We have the oldest base in the country. Most of those women are working so that they can have health care benefits for their family because their husband has a job and no health care benefits. They're not flying for the pension. They're not flying for the salary. They're flying to keep their health care benefits until they can get to Medicare.

The Republicans want to focus on their message—no matter what the

facts are. Republicans say that health care reform is bad for American business. The National Business Group on Health, a collection of nearly 300 large employers including Wal-Mart, Lockheed Martin and others, disagrees and says repeal will be bad, bad for businesses.

I will close by quoting, in a somber splash of honesty, the economics editor of the Wall Street Journal. On January 6, just 2 weeks ago, he wrote:

Talking about repeal of the health care law—remember, this is the Wall Street Journal—talking about repeal of the health care law may be a winning political strategy for Republicans, a rare way to please both workers and business executives, and here is what they finally end with—as long as they don't actually succeed in doing it.

The health care law isn't a job killing bill. It's good for business, it's good for American taxpayers, it's good for consumers, it's good for everybody in the society, and I urge my colleagues to recognize that words really do matter and they should stop mischaracterizing the health care law and confusing the American people.

BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor and privilege of visiting the wounded warriors at Bethesda Naval Hospital. Each one of the young men I saw, the oldest being 23, is very special, as are all of our men and women in uniform.

The medical staff at both Bethesda and Walter Reed is truly amazing. They have done a wonderful job repairing the broken bodies and spirits of our young servicemembers.

The number of wounded warriors returning from war has become more prevalent with the increased use of IEDs by the enemy. More and more of our young men and women are returning without their arms and legs. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, as a constant reminder of the pain of war, I show you this picture of a young triple amputee and his wife. This man gave his body for this country and will struggle for the rest of his life. How many more will have to return home in this condition?

This young man and his wife have just returned from the hospital. He is in a wheelchair. He lost an arm and two legs and he is looking at a beautiful American flag that was on the wall that had been drawn for him.

It is time we declare victory and get our troops out of Afghanistan. It is evident that President Karzai does not appreciate our commitment. If he did, he would not be so corrupt. If he did, he would not have made the comments that he now has three main enemies—the Taliban, the United States and the international community as stated in

the Washington Post on December 13. He said that if he had to choose sides today, he would choose the Taliban. The Taliban are killing American service men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined DENNIS KUCINICH as well as many other members of both parties in the hope that President Obama will keep his promise to start withdrawing our troops in July of this year.

□ 1920

In closing, I would like to urge the American people to get engaged in this cause and to let their Members of Congress know how they feel. They must encourage the Members of Congress to vote to bring our troops home. The pain must end, and we can easily declare a victory and bring our brave men and women home.

Mr. Speaker, as I do all the time on the floor of the House when I speak, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right for the American people. I ask God to give strength, wisdom, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right for the American people. And three times I will ask God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is now in its 10th straight year of war. The military occupation of Afghanistan is longer than any war in our Nation's history. An entire generation of young people—including my three grandchildren who came with me to visit Washington for the swearing in—is growing up knowing nothing but a Nation at war.

This war is not just a moral abomination with devastating human costs, and it is not just fiscally irresponsible and unsustainable with a price tag of about \$370 billion, though it most certainly is all of that. Perhaps the most tragic irony of this war is, for all of the sacrifice, it is not even doing what it was supposed to do: keeping us safe and defeating a terrorist threat.

If Iraq and Afghanistan have proven anything to us, Mr. Speaker, it is that we need an entirely new national security model; one that emphasizes brain over brawn; one that uses soft power instead of hard; one that protects America by relying on the most honorable American values—love of freedom, desire for peace, moral leadership, and compassion for the people of the world. With these values in mind, this week I

once again introduced a resolution calling for the adoption of a SMART Security platform. SMART Security would redirect our energy and resources away from warfare and it would focus instead on nonproliferation, conflict prevention, international diplomacy, and multilateralism. That means renewing our commitment to cooperation with other nations through the United Nations and other international institutions.

SMART Security would build on the new START treaty ratified last month and move us more aggressively toward a goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons. It would rearrange our budget priorities so we are no longer throwing billions of dollars at weapons systems designed for a different era and instead invest in human capital around the world. That means addressing root causes of instability and violent conflict by increasing development aid and debt relief to poor countries.

We would be supporting programs that promote sustainable development, that promote democracy building, human rights education, a strong civil society, gender equality, education for women and girls, and much, much more.

The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review recently completed at the State Department reaffirms the principles underlying SMART Security, calling for civilian power to lead the way in resolving conflicts and reducing threats around the world, with diplomacy and development mutually reinforcing one other; also strongly recommending a renewed focus on the rights of women and girls.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that might doesn't make right. The conventional wisdom of peace through strength does not work, especially in an era with the greatest threats we face being from nonstate actors.

A national security based on occupation and conquest has been given a chance to work over the last decade, and it has failed miserably. What we need in Afghanistan is a civilian surge, not a military surge. For the security of the American and the Afghan people, we need to be humanitarian partners, not military occupiers. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to bring our troops home and implement SMART Security principles. It is time that we do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOLD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEFENDING OUR BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in October, five Members of Con-

gress wrote to the President—myself, TED POE of Texas, RALPH HALL of Texas, PETE OLSON of Texas, and ED ROYCE of California—and we asked the President to take more steps to deal with the problems on the Texas border because people have been killed and beaten up down there. Shots have been fired across the border. And 80 miles into the country, the United States of America, we have signs telling people, warning people not to go south of there because they might be in danger from Mexican drug cartels or people across the border who are spying for the drug cartels. So there is a real problem.

Well, we didn't get an answer back from the President. And so we wrote again in November, and again we didn't get a reply. And then around the end of December, we got a reply from Homeland Security, from a fellow in Legislative Affairs, and he went through the same song and dance that they have gone through for a long time, talking about how they are solving the problem on the border.

Just recently in the last few weeks, four road workers were out there in Texas and they were working on the roads trying to fill potholes with gravel and do some other things. It was a shovel-ready project, incidentally. And they were fired at from across the border, which was about half a mile away. The bullets didn't hit any of them, but it sure scared the dickens out of them. And Mike Doyle, the chief deputy of the Hudspeth County Sheriff's Office, said that a rancher spotted a white pickup truck fleeing the area on the Mexican side after the shots were fired, and they think that the drug cartel may have been firing those shots to divert attention away from what was going on there in order to get drugs smuggled across the border.

The reason I bring all of this up once again is because we sent 17,000 National Guard troops down to deal with the oil spill in the gulf, and it was something that we should have done. We should have dealt with that problem as quickly as possible to make sure that we stopped any environmental damage that might accrue from that, and to help the people from Louisiana who were suffering, and the other border States down there. But we haven't done anything but send about 1,400 National Guard troops down to the border, or close to the border, and many of them have been withdrawn.

We have to do something to protect that 1,980-mile border between us and Mexico. Americans can't go within 80 miles of the border of Arizona and Mexico because there is a threat for their safety and security. That is something we cannot tolerate as a Nation. We have a war going on on the Mexican-American border, and we have to do whatever is necessary to protect Americans and to stop the drug trafficking coming across that border.

We did it in Colombia with Plan Colombia, and that is not on our border. That is down south of the Panama

Canal. So we really need to address this problem.

So if I were talking to the President tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would say:

Mr. President, come on, let's do what has to be done to protect our southern border. We are doing the job over in the Far East; we are doing the job over in the Middle East, and that's okay.

□ 1930

Yet our border, our front yard, is threatened every single day by these drug cartels and by these terrorists coming across the border, and American ranchers and businesspeople cannot conduct their daily lives down there because there is no real security.

So, if I were talking to the President, I would say:

Mr. President, please review this issue. Don't ignore Members of Congress, five Members who wrote you, who are concerned about this issue. Don't ignore us. Do something about it, and please don't send us any more of these inane letters that really don't say anything about solving the problem. It's a real problem about the security of this country and about the people who live down there and traverse that area.

Mr. President, let's get on with it.

OCTOBER 26, 2010.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America, the White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you today to express our extreme concern regarding the deteriorating security situation along our Nation's southern border. It seems that every day brings a new report of some atrocity; the most recent being the apparent murder of a U.S. citizen at Falcon Lake, Texas; yet little if anything appears to be being done by our government or the Mexican government to stop the bloodshed and bring the perpetrators to justice.

Protecting our borders and our citizens is a paramount responsibility of the Federal government; enshrined in the preamble of the Constitution. It would be an unforgivable breach of our constitutional responsibilities if we do not take stronger measures not only to prevent the upward spiral of violence from further spilling over into the United States and threaten the safety of U.S. citizens on American soil but to reclaim those areas of our border already overrun by smugglers and criminals. We can no longer pretend that this is simply Mexico's problem. The time has come to recognize that the drug violence along the border is a direct threat to the United States and act accordingly.

First, it has become apparent that the Mexican government and law enforcement authorities are either unwilling or unable to address this problem unilaterally. Therefore, we believe it is imperative that you immediately begin serious dialogue with President Calderon on building a comprehensive framework, in the spirit of Plan Colombia, that will better coordinate a more aggressive and proactive strategy to turn the tide of this conflict.

Second, we must complete construction of the border fence. Any responsibility we have to minimize the impact of the fence on the physical landscape or native species in the region pales in comparison when measured against the value of human lives that will be lost if we do not seal the border.

Finally, we believe it is critical that we deploy additional National Guard troops to the